

Serial No. 09/901,878
Amdt. dated August 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2004

Attorney Docket No. LX00071

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 54 through 60 remain in this application. Claim 54 has been amended.

Claims 54 through 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The above Action states that the language "circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data for text recognition" of claim 54 is not supported by the original disclosure. In support of this assertion, the above Action references the language "[i]n this mode, the user interface displays a QWERTY keyboard 132 in the input area and a word correction window 134" (page 9, lines 7 through 8).

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's interpretation of the present invention as claimed. It should be noted that the specification broadly describes many embodiments of the present invention, but claim 54 is more narrowly directed to a particular embodiment of the present invention. FIG. 1 shows a device 100 with an input area 104 having a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data for text recognition. FIG. 2 shows a device with an input area having another window for a word correction keyboard. The input area 104 is described broadly by the specification, and no language in the present application states that the window for handwritten data is the same as the window for the word correction keyboard. Accordingly, the input area 104 of FIGs. 1 and 2 are the same, but the windows may be different. On the other hand, claim 54 is directed to an input area having a window for handwritten data, such as the one shown in FIG. 1, and is not directed to an input area having a

Serial No. 09/901,878
Amdt. dated August 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2004

Attorney Docket No. LX00071

window for a word correction keyboard as shown FIG. 2. Although the collection of various embodiments described by the specification cover a broader scope than the embodiment of claim 54, the specification clearly describes the embodiment covered by claim 54 in full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same.

The above Action also references page 11, lines 13 through 15, which states "[i]n step 114, a check is made to determine when the handwritten entry is complete; this is typically done with a timer, by pressing a space key or by a special pen gesture." The Examiner has, apparently, interpreted this language as applying to a single embodiment but, in fact, this language may apply to three different embodiments. In fact, for the embodiment covered by claim 54, the check for completeness is made with a timer, not by either of the other two methods. Thus, the specification clearly describes the embodiment covered by claim 54 in full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 54 through 60 are respectfully requested.

Claims 54 through 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,367,453 to Capps, et al. ("Capps, et al. patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,838,302 to Kuriyama, et al. ("Kuriyama, et al. patent").

Serial No. 09/901,878
Amdt. dated August 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2004

Attorney Docket No. LX00071

Claim 54 as amended provides, *inter alia*, "a circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text". In contrast, the Capps, et al. patent, the Kuriyama, et al. patent, and the combination of these patents do not describe or suggest a circuit configured to provide a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text, as required by amended claim 54.

The above Action states that the Capps, et al. patent describes "gestures" that are performed by hand, using a stylus, and must be recognized by the system so that the appropriate operations can be performed in response. Claim 54 as amended is directed to handwritten data corresponding to text and, thus, excludes other types of hand gestures such as object selection. The Capps, et al. patent describes write-anywhere devices in which any part of the screen may be used to select actions as well as receive/display handwritten input. The Capps, et al. patent does not describe or suggest a window for exclusively receiving and displaying handwritten data corresponding to text, as required by amended claim 54. Therefore, amended claim 54 distinguishes patentably from the Capps, et al. patent, the Kuriyama, et al. patent, and the combination of these patents.

Claims 55 through 60 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 54. Therefore, claims 55 through 60 distinguish patentably from the Capps, et al. patent, the Kuriyama, et al. patent, and the combination of these patents for the reasons stated above for claim 54.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 54 through 60 are respectfully requested.

Serial No. 09/901,878
Amdt. dated August 30, 2004
Reply to Office Action of June 3, 2004

Attorney Docket No. LX00071

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048

Respectfully submitted,
Seni, Giovanni, et al.



Hisashi D. Watanabe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

08/30/04

Date